

Can the GPC standard eliminate consent banners in the EU?

Sebastian Zimmeck, Wesleyan University & Visiting Professor at Columbia University 2025/26

szimmeck@wesleyan.edu

Harshvardhan J. Pandit, AI Accountability Lab, Trinity College Dublin me@harshp.com

Frederik Zuiderveen Borgesius, Radboud University frederikzb@cs.ru.nl

Cristiana Teixeira Santos, Utrecht University c.teixeirasantos@uu.nl

Konrad Kollnig, Maastricht University konrad.kollnig@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Robin Berjon, IPFS Foundation & Supramundane Agency robin@berjon.com

Abstract

In the EU, the General Data Protection Regulation and the ePrivacy Directive mandate informed consent for behavioural advertising and use of tracking technologies. However, the ubiquity of consent banners and popups has led to widespread consent fatigue and questions regarding the effectiveness of these mechanisms in protecting users' data. In contrast, users in California and other US jurisdictions can utilize Global Privacy Control (GPC), a browser-based privacy signal that automatically broadcasts a legally binding opt-out request to websites. In this paper we explore whether, and to what extent, GPC can be adapted to the EU legal framework to mitigate consent fatigue and improve privacy protections for EU residents.

We analyse GPC as a technical specification standardized at the World Wide Web Consortium and examine its standing under current EU data protection law. Generally, GPC can be mapped to the various legal bases for processing under the GDPR. However, our evaluation also identifies friction between the GPC specification and EU data protection law as it stands. These discrepancies are resolvable and present an opportunity for EU legislators and regulators to interpret GPC in alignment with EU data protection requirements, particularly, considering the European Commission's recent Digital Omnibus proposal. We conclude that while GPC is not a silver bullet, its adoption—supported by clear authoritative guidance and specification updates—can offer a pragmatic path toward more automated and effective data protection in the EU.

Keywords

privacy, GDPR, ePrivacy Directive, Digital Omnibus, California Consumer Privacy Act, consent, standards

1 Introduction

On 19 November 2025, the European Commission presented its Digital Omnibus simplification package.¹ Motivated by international competitive pressures and worries about limited economic

¹ European Commission (2025). Digital Omnibus Regulation Proposal.

<https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/digital-omnibus-regulation-proposal>.

growth in the EU,² the package tries to reduce the burden arguably imposed on business by various laws governing the online space in the European Union, including the 2016 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)³ and the 2009 ePrivacy Directive.⁴ A key innovation of the Digital Omnibus is the proposal to use technical standards to respond to the deluge of consent banners that users face when browsing online. It is in this context that we explore how Global Privacy Control (GPC),⁵ as the most widely used technical specification for opting out and legally enforced in California and other states in the US, can be used in EU data protection law. We ask whether GPC can help to overcome EU citizens' *consent fatigue*.

Providing notice to inform an individual's legal decision has a long history. In the EU, *informed consent*—or *notice and choice*, as it is known in the US—is a core principle of online privacy.⁶ Compared to mandatory statutory requirements, informed consent is intended to provide flexibility for companies to innovate in the online space and pursue business models within the boundaries of applicable laws. However, many see informed consent as ineffective.⁷ In particular, the GDPR applies broadly to the processing of personal data and imposes a variety of obligations on *data controllers*, i.e., natural or legal persons who determine the data processing purposes and its means.⁸ For some data processing activities, such as behavioural advertising, the GDPR requires data controllers to obtain individual's consent.⁹ While the GDPR sets the requirements for determining the validity of a data subjects' consent, the 2009 ePrivacy Directive,¹⁰ in its Article 5(3), requires any party that stores or accesses information on a user's

² Mario Draghi (2024). The future of European competitiveness.

https://commission.europa.eu/topics/competitiveness/draghi-report_en.

³ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), OJ 2016 L 119/1.

⁴ ePrivacy Directive 2009 – Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) (Official Journal L 201, 31/07/2002 P. 0037 – 0047), as amended by Directive 2006/24/EC [the Data Retention Directive], and Directive 2009/136/EC [the Citizen's Rights Directive].

⁵ Global Privacy Control, <https://globalprivacycontrol.org/>.

⁶ Article 8(2) Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

⁷ Utz, C., Degeling, M., Fahl, S., Schaub, F., & Holz, T. (2019). (Un)informed Consent: Studying GDPR Consent Notices in the Field. Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS), Nouvon, F., Soe, M., Santos, C., & Serna, J. (2022). Dark Patterns after the GDPR: Vanishing, Reconfigured, or Persistent? Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PoPETs), 2022(3); F.J. Zuiderveen Borgesius, Improving privacy protection in the area of behavioural targeting, Information Law Series, Kluwer Law International 2015, <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.434236>.

⁸ Article 4(7) GDPR.

⁹ Article 29 Data Protection Working Party, Opinion 06/2014 on the Notion of Legitimate Interests of the Data Controller under Article 7 of Directive 95/46/EC, (Apr. 9, 2014), https://ec.europa.eu/justice/article-29/documentation/opinion-recommendation/files/2014/wp217_en.pdf, p. 46-47.

¹⁰ ePrivacy Directive 2009 – Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) (Official Journal L 201, 31/07/2002 P. 0037 – 0047), as amended by Directive 2006/24/EC [the Data Retention Directive], and Directive 2009/136/EC [the Citizen's Rights Directive]. See also Recital 173, GDPR.

device to obtain that user's informed consent, which functionally governs the use of cookies and other tracking technologies.

The requirements of the GDPR and ePrivacy Directive are implemented on websites in the form of popups or banners that act as consent interfaces. The design, usability, and effect of these interfaces have been studied extensively in various settings and academic communities.¹¹ Studies have shown that existing consent interfaces are often not compliant with EU law.¹² They often implement deceptive practices—*deceptive patterns*, also called *dark patterns*—that trick users into consenting.¹³ But even if sites do not implement dark patterns, users are tired of repetitive decision-making on nearly every site they visit and experience consent fatigue.¹⁴

In contrast to this burdensome, per-site interaction, consumers in California and a number of other states in the US can, just once, enable a Global Privacy Control (GPC) setting in their browser.¹⁵ Once they do, their browser automatically broadcasts a legally binding signal to every website they visit, asserting their right to opt out of the sale or sharing of personal information.¹⁶ Unlike the legally unsupported Do Not Track (DNT) signal from 2009,¹⁷ businesses are required to respect GPC in various states.¹⁸ The offices of the California, Colorado, and Connecticut attorneys general have already started enforcing this legal obligation.¹⁹ Following the adoption

¹¹ For a comprehensive overview see E. Birrell et al., "SoK: Technical Implementation and Human Impact of Internet Privacy Regulations," in 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), San Francisco, CA, USA, 2024, pp. 673-696, doi: 10.1109/SP54263.2024.00206.

¹² Santos, C., Bielova, N., & Matte, C. (2020). Are cookie banners indeed compliant with the law? : Deciphering EU legal requirements on consent and technical means to verify compliance of cookie banners. *Technology and Regulation*, 2020, 91-135. <https://doi.org/10.71265/g317tv72>.

¹³ See, e.g., Colin M. Gray, Cristiana Teixeira Santos, Nataliia Bielova, and Thomas Mildner. 2024. An Ontology of Dark Patterns Knowledge: Foundations, Definitions, and a Pathway for Shared Knowledge-Building. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 289, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642436>.

¹⁴ Bart van der Sloot, *European Data Protection Law Review*, Volume 10 (2024), Issue 1, 1 - 8, Editorial, <https://edpl.lexxion.eu/article/edpl/2024/1/3/display/html>. 7. F.J. Zuiderveen Borgesius, 'Behavioural sciences and the regulation of privacy on the Internet', in A-L Sibony and A. Alemanno (eds.), *Nudge and the law - what can EU law learn from behavioural sciences?*, p. 179-207, Hart Publishing, 2015. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.20637>.

¹⁵ Global Privacy Control, <https://globalprivacycontrol.org/>.

¹⁶ Users could also make per-site choices if they so desire.

¹⁷ California State Legislature, California Online Privacy Protection Act, https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=8.&chapter=22.&lawCode=BPC.

¹⁸ As of 7 December 2025 California, Colorado, Connecticut, and New Jersey require businesses to respect GPC signals.

¹⁹ Office of the California Attorney General, Attorney General Bonta Announces Settlement with Sephora as Part of Ongoing Enforcement of California Consumer Privacy Act, <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-announces-settlement-sephora-part-ongoing-enforcement>, Office of the California Attorney General, Attorney General Bonta Announces Largest CCPA Settlement to Date, Secures \$1.55 Million from Healthline.com, <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-announces-largest-ccpa-settlement-date-secures-155>, Office of the Connecticut Attorney General, Connecticut, California and Colorado Announce Joint Investigative Privacy Sweep, <https://portal.ct.gov/ag/press-releases/2025-press-releases/connecticut-california-and-colorado-announce-joint-investigative-privacy-sweep>.

and legal enforceability of GPC, the signal is also being standardized at the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) as a technical specification.²⁰ It is thus likely to become further integrated into the web. A recent amendment to the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), the California Opt Me Out Act per California Assembly Bill 566,²¹ requires a business that develops or maintains a browser to include functionality to send an opt-out preference signal by 1 January 2027.

Generally, instead of repeatedly showing them popups asking for consent to allow tracking on every site they visit, GPC allows users to express an objection that can apply to every site they visit. It has the potential to mitigate the effects of consent fatigue and may also, by removing the need for consent popups and requests, eliminate or reduce deceptive patterns. GPC is a simple binary signal that can be implemented on every platform that uses the web as the underlying communication protocol. Thus, for example, it can be used in smartphones, IoT devices, and can be configured at the device-, operating system-, or app-level.²²

In this paper, we explore the question to which extent GPC can be applied in the context of informed consent in the EU. In doing so, we identify the potential but also limitations of GPC within the current EU framework. We make recommendations to improve the development and documentation of GPC to assist in implementing it fully within the EU. We also evaluate recent regulatory developments in the EU that involve the Commission proposing a new Digital Fairness Act and the Digital Omnibus to address cookie consent and use of browser-based signals. For the latter, we identify recommendations for lawmakers to consider the use of GPC within the EU's developing legal framework.

Our evaluation is structured as follows: section 2 provides a brief history of technical privacy controls on the web, section 3 explains what GPC is, section 4 discusses the application of GPC under EU law, and section 5 contains brief conclusions.

2 A Brief History of Privacy Controls on the Web

Over the years, there have been various attempts to move beyond the current manual informed consent implementations. Looking back at the history of these attempts, particularly, their successes and failures, is instructive for evaluating the potential of GPC adoption in the EU as well as the adoption of automated and machine-readable choice architectures more broadly.

The first major effort to automate users' privacy choices was the Platform for Privacy Preferences Project (P3P), which was standardized at the W3C in the early 2000s.²³ P3P was an ambitious technical standard designed to allow websites to declare their data collection

²⁰ Sebastian Zimmeck, Peter Snyder, Justin Brookman, Aram Zucker-Scharff, Global Privacy Control (GPC), <https://w3c.github.io/gpc/>.

²¹ California State Legislature, AB-566 California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018: opt-out preference signal, https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB566.

²² Throughout this paper we focus on 'websites' with the understanding that what we discuss also applies to mobile apps, internet-enabled services, and other digital technologies.

²³ Cranor, L. F. (2002). Web Privacy with P3P. O'Reilly & Associates.

practices in a machine-readable format. Users could, for example, configure their browsers to automatically accept or reject cookies based on whether a site's practices matched their predefined privacy settings. However, P3P faced challenges; its XML-based policy format was complex for websites to implement, and browser support was limited and inconsistent. It failed to gain widespread adoption.²⁴ There were also some usability issues with a P3P user agent being perceived as annoying by some users.²⁵ Ultimately, P3P was abandoned.

After P3P, Do Not Track (DNT) emerged as a simpler signal.²⁶ Standardised at the W3C from 2009 onwards, DNT allowed users to indicate their preference to permit or prohibit being tracked when accessing websites. While most major browsers implemented the DNT setting, its broad effect was negligible. In particular, legal backing for the standard was limited. An important exception was a 2013 amendment to the California Online Privacy Protection Act (CalOPPA) that requires websites to disclose how they respond to DNT signals.²⁷ Notably, the amendment does not require them to respect the signal. Further, the standard left the definition of 'tracking' up to individual companies and regulators, which led to a stalemate where the advertising industry largely ignored the signal, claiming a lack of consensus and legal mandate.²⁸

Another major point of contention was DNT's default setting. The advertising industry particularly criticised Microsoft's decision to have DNT enabled by default in its Internet Explorer browser as not being a clear indication of the user's preferences but rather a paternalistic decision by Microsoft as browser vendor.²⁹ The sole case for DNT to have legal enforceability is a recent isolated German state court decision where LinkedIn was obligated to respect the DNT signal, though, only because LinkedIn had claimed to do so in its privacy policy.³⁰ Overall, it is no longer feasible to support DNT or base enforcement actions on it as browser vendors have started removing it from their settings and implementations. Of note, the Firefox browser specifically points to GPC as a successor in its DNT deprecation page.³¹

In parallel to user-facing signals the advertising industry has been developing its own technical standards to manage and propagate consent signals throughout the online advertising ecosystem. Most notably, the Interactive Advertising Bureau's (IAB) has been developing its Transparency and Consent Framework (TCF) to represent user choices and transmit them to ad networks and other third parties using Real-Time Bidding (RTB) for tracking-based advertising.

²⁴ Reidenberg, J. R., et al. (2014). Disagreeable Privacy Policies: Mismatches between Meaning and Users' Understanding. Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 30.

²⁵ Lorrie Faith Cranor, Praveen Guduru, Manjula Arjula, User Interfaces for Privacy Agents, <https://lorrie.cranor.org/pubs/privacy-bird-20040802.pdf>.

²⁶ Mayer, J. R., & Mitchell, J. C. (2012). Third-Party Web Tracking: Policy and Technology. 2012 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy.

²⁷ IAPP (2013). What Do the New Disclosure Requirements Under CalOPPA Mean for Your Business? <https://iapp.org/news/a/what-do-the-new-disclosure-requirements-under-caloppa-mean-for-your-business>.

²⁸ Future of Privacy Forum (n.d.). <https://fpf.org/thank-you-for-visiting-allaboutdnt-com/>.

²⁹ Lynch, B. (2012) Do Not Track in the Windows 8 Setup Experience.

³⁰ Landgericht Berlin, 1.12.2022, 52 O 157/22.

³¹ Mozilla, How do I turn on the Do Not Track feature?, <https://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/how-do-i-turn-do-not-track-feature>.

The TCF has faced significant legal challenges, in particular, as the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) upheld the Belgian Data Protection Authority's findings that it violates the GDPR.³² In response the IAB is updating the TCF and, independently, is integrating it into the Global Privacy Platform (GPP), which aims to consolidate the TCF with similar frameworks of the IAB in other regions of the world. TCF and GPP are only intended for propagating users' privacy choices across the advertising ecosystem. They rely on consent banners or automated signals, such as GPC, as user-facing mechanisms and, as such, do not help in mitigating consent fatigue. Additionally, they are often implemented in ways that result in harms to individual's rights and contravene the principles of GDPR.³³

Other granular frameworks for privacy choices have also been proposed, such as Advanced Data Protection Control (ADPC), which is intended to be aligned with the EU's GDPR,³⁴ and the Data Rights Protocol (DRP), which is designed for comprehensively communicating data rights, not just the opt-out right.³⁵ Consenter, which is certified under the German Telecommunications and Telemedia Data Protection Act (TTDSG, 2021),³⁶ is a privacy manager that allows users to set preferences through a browser extension which is then communicated to the website in a manner that allows automated acceptance and rejection of consent through an ephemeral popup.³⁷ Other similar mechanisms are also being developed across the globe, such as the 'consent manager' under India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP, 2023). The IEEE 7012-2025 Standard for Machine Readable Personal Privacy Terms allows individuals to express their privacy requirements, such as whether to share data with third parties, as contractual terms which the websites then agree with to create a contractual relationship.³⁸ To the extent that fine-grained frameworks, such as ADPC, expose user choices to first and third parties, those choices are susceptible of being abused for tracking in the form of browser fingerprinting. Browser vendors will be hesitant to implement any solutions that increase their browser's tracking surface.³⁹

The European Data Protection Board (EDPB), in continuation of its predecessor Article 29 Working Party, has acknowledged the potential of automated technical signals, noting that while

³² Court of Justice of the European Union. (2024). Judgment in Case C-604/22, IAB Europe; Michael Veale, Midas Nouwens and Cristiana Teixeira Santos, Impossible asks: Can the Transparency and Consent Framework Ever Authorise Real-Time Bidding After the Belgian DPA Decision? Technology and Regulation, 2022, 12-22 • <https://doi.org/10.26116/techreg.2022.002>.

³³ Matte, C., Santos, C., & Bielova, N. (2020, June). Purposes in IAB Europe's TCF: which legal basis and how are they used by advertisers?. In Annual Privacy Forum (pp. 163-185).

³⁴ Gerben & Human, S. (2021) Advanced Data Protection Control (ADPC) <https://www.dataprotectioncontrol.org/>. For a comparison of GPC with ADPC, see Data Protection and Consenting Communication Mechanisms: Current Open Proposals and Challenges <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW55150.2022.00029>.

³⁵ Consumer Reports, Data Rights Protocol, <https://datarightsprotocol.org/>.

³⁶ Dienste zur Einwilligungsverwaltung nach § 26 TDDDG (accessed Nov. 2025).

³⁷ Consenter (2025) www.consenter.eu/.

³⁸ IEEE 7012-2025: IEEE Approved Draft Standard for Machine Readable Personal Privacy Terms <https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/7012/7192/>.

³⁹ Browser or device fingerprinting is a tracking technique in which the user's information and configurations, such as browser version, language used, screen size, are used to create a unique 'fingerprint' for identifying the user across websites.

DNT's adoption was hampered by a lack of legal enforceability, technically specified signals for consent or objection could be a valid way forward under the GDPR.⁴⁰ The recent proposal under the Omnibus package provides the first explicit use of automated technical signals to manage consent and privacy choices within the EU.⁴¹ Under the proposal, the EU wants to develop standards that can assist data subjects in communicating their privacy preferences and as a consequence reduce the burden of interactions and decisions they need to make on websites. Another relevant proposal in this context is the Digital Fairness Act which aims to address issues regarding deceptive patterns, choice, and consumer harms.⁴² However, both proposals are still in the early stages of the lawmaking process, and the associated standards development processes also take a few years. While we have some considerations for the integration of automated signals into the future legal framework of the EU, we mainly focus on the use of GPC in the EU framework as it stands today.

3 What Is GPC?




Figure 1. Overview of the GPC signal sent by the user's browser (GPC = 1), which indicates to a visited website that the user does not want their personal data to be sold or shared with third parties or be used for cross-context ad targeting. This choice could then be further propagated by third parties to fourth parties, for example, via the TCF (not shown). The GPC signal is attached to every request the user makes to a website.

3.1 Overview, History, and Legal Backing

GPC is a technical signal that expresses an individuals' privacy and data processing preferences to internet services, including apps and websites, that they interact with. These preferences, as defined in a specification in development at the W3C, are to not sell or share data with third parties and to not have the data be used for cross-context ad targeting.⁴³ GPC is an abstract signal that can support different legal interpretations depending on the applicable law. In that sense, GPC is generally jurisdiction-agnostic. Legislators and regulators have broad leeway to define the meaning of a GPC signal under the laws they enact and enforce. The GPC specification was developed against the background of emerging US state privacy laws and in

⁴⁰ European Data Protection Board (EDPB). (2020). Guidelines 05/2020 on consent under Regulation 2016/679.

https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2023-12/edpb_letter_out2023-0099_donottrack_en.pdf.

⁴¹ Digital Omnibus Regulation Proposal (19 Nov. 2025) European Commission.

⁴² Ares(2025)5829481 Digital Fairness Act (2025) European Commission.

⁴³ Global Privacy Control (GPC) W3C Editor's Draft 25 November 2025, <https://w3c.github.io/gpc/>.

the context of the web platform. However, it is principally applicable in any jurisdiction worldwide, including the GDPR,⁴⁴ and on different platforms, such as smart cars or TVs. To avoid ambiguity, we analyse the W3C GPC specification as of its current version.⁴⁵

While DNT failed to gain legal enforceability,⁴⁶ GPC has achieved legal recognition and enforceability in four US federal states already, and more states are likely to join in the future. California was the first state to make the use of GPC enforceable through the CCPA where the use of GPC must be treated as a legally binding request of the user to opt out of the sale or sharing of personal information or contextual ad targeting.⁴⁷ This legal backing and the ensuing enforcement activities by state attorneys general led to further adoption by browsers and websites, including notably media publishers, giving GPC the momentum and enforceability that DNT lacked. Compliance of websites is also increasing.⁴⁸ This grounding has created a certainty regarding the continued use of GPC, with even the advertising industry incorporating the use of GPC in their technical specifications.⁴⁹

3.2 GPC's Main Characteristics

Meaning of *Preference* and Legal Interpretation. Per the GPC specification, with a *preference* individuals specify whether they want their data to be processed and then the recipients of that preference map the preference to a legal requirement to implement it. For example, in California, the use of GPC is interpreted as exercising the opt-out right as defined in the CCPA. The GPC specification does not prescribe a fixed interpretation for the meaning of a GPC signal and instead requires the relevant legislators, regulators, and other authorities responsible for online privacy to formulate this interpretation. In jurisdictions where GPC is applied, the relevant laws and their interpretations determine the application of the GPC signal and how the user's preferences must be implemented as part of implementers' obligations. If there is no clear interpretation or legal obligation to implement GPC, then it is up to the website that receives GPC signals to determine how to best implement the user's preferences.

Main Focus Is on a Single Controller. Generally, the GPC specification intends to give users a means to limit their interaction to a single controller, i.e., the entity represented by the website the user intentionally visits and wants to interact with, also called *first party*.⁵⁰ This approach to

⁴⁴ Robin Berjon, GPC under the GDPR, <https://berjon.com/gpc-under-the-gdpr/>, Harshvardhan Pandit, GPC + GDPR: will it work?, <https://harshp.com/research/blog/gpc-gdpr-can-it-work>.

⁴⁵ As the W3C GPC specification is evolving in the standardisation process, our analysis here is based on the version dated 25 November 2025.

⁴⁶ See section 2.

⁴⁷ California Office of the Attorney General. (2021). Press Release: Attorney General Bonta Announces Settlement with Sephora.

⁴⁸ Kate Hausladen, Oliver Wang, Sophie Eng, Jocelyn Wang, Francisca Wijaya, Matt May and Sebastian Zimmeck, Websites' Global Privacy Control Compliance at Scale and over Time, 34th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security), <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/usenixsecurity25-hausladen.pdf>.

⁴⁹ IAB Tech Lab. (2023). Global Privacy Platform (GPP) Specification.

⁵⁰ The initial name used for GPC during development was 'Signal of a Preference for One Controller' (SPOC) to indicate that the user wishes to interact only with the website they are visiting and does not want to manage hundreds of third parties.

privacy aligns with the theory of contextual integrity.⁵¹ For example, it aligns with the experiences of individuals in consumer interactions when they buy goods from a shop and interact with the shop for buying them, returning them, or exercising other rights. GPC envisions a similar simplified and streamlined experience for users regarding their online privacy. Most users do not want to interact with ad networks integrated on news websites or other integrated third parties but only want to interact with the first party news sites. The GPC specification defines a *third party* as any entity that is not the (sole) controller of the data processing.

In jurisdictions where the communication of the user's preferences triggers specific rights, the use of GPC can be interpreted as supporting these rights. Illustrative examples regarding such legal effects are provided in the GPC specification for laws such as the CCPA and the GDPR. The specification also references a dedicated guide document. However, the examples in the specification and in the guide are non-normative, i.e., not legally binding, as those documents do not have the authority to declare whether GPC is applicable in a particular jurisdiction and, if so, what a GPC signal means under applicable law there.

How GPC Improves Over DNT. Unlike a DNT signal, which can have either of two values—(1) users permit tracking or (2) users prohibit tracking—GPC has only a single value. Users can indicate their preference to prevent data selling and sharing as well as cross-context ad targeting. If GPC is turned 'on' or 'activated,' the browser communicates this single value with each request to the website. If GPC is turned 'off' or 'deactivated,' no GPC signal is sent to the website. Thus, when GPC is turned off, there is no change in the status quo, and the website cannot assume anything just because it did not detect a GPC signal. Because GPC only communicates a single value, it cannot be used to indicate any information other than the fact that it is active. By having only a single value GPC keeps the browser fingerprinting surface low as there is as little new information as possible with which a user could be identified.⁵²

GPC's Integration into the Online Ad Ecosystem. GPC operates as a user-facing signal that triggers downstream compliance mechanisms, such as the IAB's GPP or Google's Restricted Data Processing (RDP) mode.⁵³ While third parties directly integrated into a first-party website can detect and act upon the GPC signal immediately, significant data processing occurs outside the user's browser session. For instance, personal data initially transferred to an integrated third party during a site visit may subsequently be shared server-to-server with fourth parties, such as data brokers. In other words, GPC signals are 'translated' into server-side standards. If that would not happen, downstream recipients of personal data would unknowingly process data in violation of the user's rights, creating a compliance gap between the user's browser and the backend data supply chain.


⁵¹ Nissenbaum, H. (2004). Privacy as contextual integrity. Wash. L. Rev., 79, 119.

⁵² GPC's single value results in a smaller browser fingerprinting surface as compared to P3P or ADPC, which could take multiple values.

⁵³ Google, Helping advertisers comply with the U.S. states' privacy laws in Google Ads, <https://support.google.com/google-ads/answer/9614122?hl=en>.

3.3 GPC Adoption

Various browsers and browser extensions implement GPC. Figure 2 shows how a user can turn on GPC in two browsers. At the time of writing, privacy-friendly browser vendors such as Mozilla, DuckDuckGo, and Brave, support GPC. However, as the CCPA was amended by the California Opt Me Out Act, all browsers for use by California residents will be required to implement GPC by 1 January 2027.⁵⁴ Individuals usually activate GPC through the settings of their web browser or by installing a privacy-friendly browser or browser extension that comes with GPC enabled by default. Additionally, any websites visited must also support GPC to interpret and apply it. As of 6 December 2025, over 380.000 sites support GPC,⁵⁵ among which are Amazon, the National Football League, and Spotify. A recent study reports that people receive fewer tracking cookies when they enable GPC.⁵⁶



⁵⁴ California State Legislature, AB-566 California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018: opt-out preference signal, https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB566.

⁵⁵ GPC SUP, Check if a site supports Global Privacy Control, <https://gpcsup.com/>.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., <https://petsymposium.org/popets/2025/popets-2025-0138.pdf>: 'Our findings reveal that around 50% of websites send at least one intractable cookie, with the majority set to expire after more than 10 days. In addition, enabling the Global Privacy Control (GPC) signal initially reduces the number of intractable cookies by 30% on average, with a further 32% reduction possible on subsequent visits by rejecting the banners.'

Figure 2. GPC can be enabled from the settings of many privacy-friendly browsers, including Firefox (top) and DuckDuckGo (bottom). Mainstream browsers, such as Google Chrome and Apple's Safari, do not yet implement GPC.

Even though GPC can be implemented on any platform that uses the web as its underlying communication protocol, it is so far only adopted in web browsers and on websites. Support in smartphones or other platforms is lacking.⁵⁷ This lack of adoption is noteworthy as many other platforms already implement advertising personalisation opt-outs, e.g., Apple via its Tracking Transparency Framework on iOS,⁵⁸ Google via its Privacy Sandbox on Android,⁵⁹ and Amazon on its Fire TV. However, these opt-out mechanisms are based on contractual agreements between developers and the respective companies and not on statutory mandates. This coexistence of statutory and contractual opt-out mechanisms is not ideal. Instead, there should be only one opt-out mechanism.

3.4 GPC Standardisation at the W3C

GPC is standardised in the W3C's Privacy Working Group. As of this writing, the specification is a *Working Draft*. As is the case for all W3C standards it is being drafted through a consensus-based mechanism. The next stages for the GPC specification are *published* and *ratified*. The W3C's standardisation process deviates from those of other standards organisations in that the W3C requires a standard to have implementation, deployment, and adoption happen *before* ratification. In fact, it is a pre-condition for a specification to become a W3C standard that it already has two meaningful real-world implementations. GPC meets the criteria for ratification and is being maintained as a draft while editorial work is carried out. Once the GPC specification has been standardised, implementations must adhere to the published standard to be conformant.

Also relevant for GPC implementers is the W3C Privacy Principles standard,⁶⁰ which was produced by the W3C's Technical Architecture Group (TAG) to ensure architectural coherence of the web. The defined contents of this standard are intended to apply to the entire web, including uses of GPC. The Privacy Principles define concepts that the GPC specification relies upon. First, the Privacy Principles specify the role of the browser as a *user agent*, which is intended to act as an intermediary representing the user on the web. Notably, the user agent is expected to help the user automate tasks that they wish to carry out. The user agent is also expected to act in their user's interest as a trustworthy agent, which is to say that the Privacy Principles give browsers extensive fiduciary duties as agents of their users.

⁵⁷ Zimmeck, S., Aggarwal, N., Liu, Z., Altman, S., & Kollnig, K. (2025). Exercising the CCPA Opt-out Right on Android: Legally Mandated but Practically Challenging, arXiv:2407.14938.

⁵⁸ Kollnig, K., Shuba, A., Van Kleek, M., Binns, R., & Shadbolt, N. (2022, June). Goodbye tracking? Impact of iOS app tracking transparency and privacy labels. In Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 508-520).

⁵⁹ Zimmeck, S., Aggarwal, N., Liu, Z., Altman, S., & Kollnig, K. (2025). Exercising the CCPA Opt-out Right on Android: Legally Mandated but Practically Challenging, arXiv:2407.14938.

⁶⁰ Robin Berjon and Jeffrey Yasskin, Privacy Principles W3C Statement 15 May 2025, <https://www.w3.org/TR/privacy-principles/>. The Privacy Principles are published as a *Statement*, which is the most mature state for documents other than technical specifications to be considered a W3C standard.

The Privacy Principles also specify how global choices should be implemented, of which GPC is one instantiation. The description is worth quoting in full:

'When an opt-out mechanism exists, it should preferably work with a global opt-out mechanism. Conceptually, a global opt-out mechanism is an automaton operating as part of the user agent. It is equivalent to a robot that would carry out a person's instructions by pressing an opt-out button (or a similar expression of the person's rights) with every interaction that the person has with a site. (For instance, the person may be objecting to processing based on legitimate interest, withdrawing consent to specific purposes, or requesting that their data not be sold or shared.) The user is effectively delegating the expression of their opt-out to their user agent, which helps rectify automation asymmetry. The Global Privacy Control (GPC) is a good example of a global opt-out mechanism.'

As the quote makes clear, GPC is intended to automate an existing legal process and thus requires legal support and enforceability. Sending a GPC signal can be seen as the data subject delegating to the browser the task of systematically and authoritatively expressing their intent of not having their data sold or shared with anyone except the single controller they want to interact with as well as not having their data used for cross-context advertising purposes.

4 Application of GPC under EU Law

In this section, we explore if and how GPC fits EU law. We focus on the GDPR and the ePrivacy Directive as the key regulations governing the selling and sharing (as processing activities) of personal data, and the use of information from the user's terminal device respectively.

4.1 Scope and Extent of GPC

Personal Data and Data Subject. The GPC specification relates to *personal information*, which can be interpreted as *personal data* under the GDPR.⁶¹ Similarly, the specification's terminology of *person* and *user* is analogous to *data subject* under the GDPR.⁶²

Actor Roles. Under the GDPR, obligations stem from an actor's role, which can be, for example, the role of a *data controller*,⁶³ *data processor*,⁶⁴ or *third party*.⁶⁵ Similarly, the GPC specification refers to entities receiving and implementing GPC signals as *parties*, with a further distinction between *first party* and *third party*. Neither the specification nor its accompanying

⁶¹ Article 4(1) GDPR.

⁶² Article 4(1) GDPR.

⁶³ Article 4(7) GDPR.

⁶⁴ Article 4(8) GDPR.

⁶⁵ Article 4(10) GDPR.

guide document describes how such roles could be interpreted or how they could align with the roles defined by the GDPR.⁶⁶

We interpret *first party* to mean *controller* under the GDPR.⁶⁷ As noted, under the GDPR, the controller is the party that determines the purposes and means of the processing of personal data.⁶⁸ The GDPR also allows multiple controllers to jointly determine the purposes and means of processing, in which case they are considered to be joint controllers.⁶⁹

The GDPR defines a *third party* as an entity that is neither a controller nor a processor.⁷⁰ The GPC specification defines a third party as 'any party other than the one the person intends to interact with.'⁷¹ Since both define *third parties* through exclusion, i.e., as entities other than the first party and controller, the determination of which entity is a third party depends on an *a priori* understanding of the entity acting as the controller or first party.

Under the GDPR, a *processor* is an entity that does something with personal data on behalf of a controller.⁷² An example could be a cloud provider who stores personal data for a controller. While the GPC specification does not directly describe the role of processors,⁷³ we do not interpret a GDPR processor as a third party given its role as an authorised entity acting on behalf of a controller. We assume the first party under GPC corresponds to the controller under the GDPR, and that third parties under the GDPR are also third parties for the GPC.⁷⁴

Legal Effects of GPC. The legal effects of GPC are determined by legislators, regulators, and other authorities under the applicable law in their jurisdiction. The GPC specification includes two broad definitions of these legal effects that these authorities can further specify and interpret. The GPC specification includes two broad concepts that authorities can further specify and interpret to form the legal effects.

First, the specification refers to *selling or sharing* of personal information, which we interpret as *processing* under the GDPR.⁷⁵ GPC provides data subjects the capability to control processing

⁶⁶ The Global Privacy Control (GPC) Legal and Implementation Considerations Guide (2025) is available at <https://w3c.github.io/gpc/explainer>.

⁶⁷ Article 4(7) GDPR.

⁶⁸ Article 4(7) GDPR.

⁶⁹ Article 26(1) GDPR. Further examination is required on how GPC operates in the context of joint controllers or non-interacting controllers, which, however, is beyond the scope of our analysis here.

⁷⁰ Article 4(10) GDPR.

⁷¹ §2 definitions in GPC specification.

⁷² Article 4(8) GDPR.

⁷³ The GPC specification does mention 'processors' in an informative context as 'instances where third party sharing may be permitted such as sharing to service providers/processors'. §5.2 GPC specification.

⁷⁴ We note that third parties under the GDPR may also qualify as joint controllers based on the factual influence of the parties, processing phases (or phases), and the determination of purposes and means of processing, as evidenced in the European Union Court of Justice jurisprudence Case C-210/16 (*Wirtschaftsakademie Schleswig-Holstein*, 2018), Case C-40/17 (*FashionID*, 2019) and Case C-604/22 (*IAB TCF*, 2024).

⁷⁵ Article 4(2) regarding 'processing of personal data' and Article 4(10) regarding third parties.

for all sites or apps or just for some.⁷⁶ While neither sharing or selling are explicitly mentioned in the GDPR's definition of processing, we consider them to be extensions of *making available*, which falls under the GDPR's definition of processing.⁷⁷ The GDPR regulates broadly any processing of personal data which includes sharing and other operations such as collection, storage, usage, and erasure. The use of sharing or selling within the GPC specification therefore concerns only these processing operations. Other forms of processing defined by the GDPR, such as collection of personal data from the data subject, are thus not covered in the GPC specification's definition of selling and sharing.

The second concept in the GPC specification is *cross-context ad targeting*. While the specification does not define *context* or *cross-context*, these terms are defined in the HTML specification,⁷⁸ which is another standard used by browser vendors to determine what constitutes tracking across websites and privacy measures they must apply to prevent such. The GPC specification uses *context* to refer to the first party website or service that a data subject is currently using. Following from this, *cross-context* means across parties or websites, and *behavioural targeting* means using the data subject's activities across websites to target ads.⁷⁹

The GPC specification intends to impose restrictions on the selling or sharing of data with third parties and for cross-context ad targeting. However, it does not intend to limit a controller's own processing activities. For example, if a controller conducts tracking and profiling of the data subject on its own site, then this activity would not be within the scope of the GPC specification. By contrast, GPC can prevent *any* third-party processing activities regardless of the purpose or justification to the extent these activities constitute data selling or sharing or cross-contextual ad targeting. We therefore consider the scope of GPC under the GDPR to be *inapplicable* to processing conducted by first parties, i.e., controllers, and *indiscriminate* with respect to third parties. GPC can only stop future data processing and does not impact ongoing processing. However, any ongoing processing would still require a valid legal basis under the GDPR.

The GPC specification includes *informative* or *non-normative*, i.e., non-binding, guidance on how GPC may be interpreted under the GDPR,⁸⁰ referring to the potential application of rights, in particular, to withdraw consent and to object to legitimate interests. The intent of this application is that if data subjects send a GPC signal, their request to prevent or stop processing of their personal data should be implemented through the relevant GDPR rights available for the used legal basis. This application follows from the GDPR requiring controllers to determine the appropriate legal basis for each scenario, which in turn determines the choices available to data subjects to permit or restrict further processing.

⁷⁶ The GPC specification alludes to such a mechanism in §2 under 'do-not-sell-or-share preference.'

⁷⁷ Article 4(2) GDPR.

⁷⁸ HTML Living Standard (1 December 2025) <https://html.spec.whatwg.org/multipage/>.

⁷⁹ Veale, M., & Borgesius, F. Z. (2022). Adtech and real-time bidding under European data protection law. *German Law Journal*, 23(2), 226-256.

⁸⁰ §5.2 GPC specification and §4.2 GPC Legal and Implementation Considerations Guide.

In the following subsections, we examine the use of GPC through illustrative scenarios reflecting common experiences of data subjects. For each scenario, we discuss the most likely legal basis and the resulting effects of using GPC under those bases. Our analysis mainly focuses on the legal bases of consent, contract performance, and legitimate interests.⁸¹ Through this approach, we determine the extent of GPC applicability and its utility for both data subjects and service providers within the EU legal framework, particularly, the GDPR and ePrivacy Directive.

4.2 Scenario 1: Third-party Ad Tracking and Consent as Legal Basis

As a first scenario we consider the data subject visiting a website that integrates third-party tracking-based advertising where third parties serve ads based on a profile, they are building by tracking the data subject's activity across multiple websites, i.e., by performing behavioural advertising. Under the GDPR, the only legal basis for such behavioural advertising is the data subject's consent.⁸² The GDPR also requires that consent is obtained prior to any processing, which means the website cannot perform behavioural advertising before the data subject has given consent. Further, as tracking and profiling for behavioural advertising typically relies on placing cookies on the data subject's device, it also requires consent under the ePrivacy Directive.⁸³ Thus, the current standard practice is that websites present a popup to data subjects requesting consent for processing data under both the GDPR and the ePrivacy Directive.

When the data subject visits the website and sends a GPC signal, the signal is communicated as part of every request made to access the website, including the first (see Figure 1). As the use of tracking and profiling by third parties qualifies as sharing data with a third party and as cross-context ad targeting, the GPC signal communicates the data subject's preference to prevent such activity. As the website receives the GPC signal before displaying any content, including the consent request popup, it can take the GPC signal into account and adjust its behaviour regarding the consent request and the accompanying popup. Other activities, such as data processing performed by the website itself are not within scope of GPC and are thus not affected by its use.

If the data subject visits the same website a second time with an active GPC signal, their wish to prevent specific processing remains the same as during the first visit. Thus, the use of GPC in each visit indicates a continued affirmation that the user's wishes have not changed. However, if the data subject visits the site without an active GPC signal, such a visit is a deviation from the initial visit where the GPC signal was communicated to the website. The GPC specification does not require a website to keep a record of whether a data subject had enabled GPC in the past, i.e., it can simply check each request when it comes in for whether it contains a GPC signal.

⁸¹ Article 6(1)(a), 6(1)(b), and 6(1)(f) GDPR.

⁸² Article 29 Data Protection Working Party, Opinion 06/2014 on the Notion of Legitimate Interests of the Data Controller under Article 7 of Directive 95/46/EC, (Apr. 9, 2014), https://ec.europa.eu/justice/article-29/documentation/opinion-recommendation/files/2014/wp217_en.pdf, p. 46-47.

⁸³ Article 5(3) ePrivacy Directive.

However, if a website does keep a record of the use of GPC, such as through a cookie,⁸⁴ it would be able to infer that a data subject has turned off GPC.

A lack of a GPC signal, even after it was previously active, cannot be interpreted as giving consent, including to any previously refused processing. GPC signals can only convey the data subject's preference to *prevent* certain types of processing, but the lack of a GPC signal does not imply a permission. Under the GDPR, consent requires an active indication, which is absent in this case. Therefore, if the data subject *turns off* their GPC signal after prior visits, the website cannot assume that the data subject now gave consent. The website can, however, view this as an opportunity to request consent. Both the GPC specification and the GDPR do not specify how and when controllers can ask for consent after the data subject initially refused such, whether the data subject did so manually or through GPC.

If a data subject consents to tracking-based advertising through a popup while the GPC signal is *active*, the validity of consent is unclear due to being ambiguous as per the GDPR. If we consider GPC as an indication of the data subject's wishes, then the consent that the data subject gives by clicking yes on the popup could be considered invalid due to the conflict between the automated GPC signal and the data subject's click.⁸⁵ The website may argue that the data subject's choice in the popup represents an explicit, intentional choice by the user, whereas the GPC signal is automated and does not constitute a deliberate action. However, the GDPR treats ambiguity in consent strictly and does not establish a hierarchy to resolve conflicts between different expressions of choice.

If a data subject consented in a prior interaction without the use of GPC and is now visiting the site again but with an *active* GPC signal, the site now has an indication of the data subject's wishes through the use of GPC that they no longer wish to continue sharing data with third parties or allow cross-context ad targeting. This use of GPC can indicate the exercise of the data subject's right to withdraw consent as per the GPC specification. The site may still decide to ask the data subject to confirm if they wish to withdraw their consent by showing a popup. On the other hand, the site may also consider that the data subject has already indicated the withdrawal by sending a GPC signal and not show a popup. Without a legally binding interpretation or obligation, benevolent interpretations of the GPC that reduce popups thus rely on the goodwill of the websites and controllers. Therefore, for the benefits from GPC to materialise, relevant regulations would need to dictate the use and effects of using GPC or similar automated means in an explicit and enforceable manner.

The first scenario illustrates that when consent serves as the legal basis the use of GPC can offer convenience to both data subjects and websites. For example, it can limit targeting and analytics cookies. However, as GPC is limited in scope to third party data sharing and

⁸⁴ Such use of cookies can be deemed necessary for the functioning of GPC and thus be exempt from consent under Article 5(3) of the ePrivacy Directive.

⁸⁵ For evidence of ambiguity between popup choices and privacy signals, see: Hills, M., Woods, D. W., & Böhme, R. (2021). Conflicting privacy preference signals in the wild. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14286>.

advertising, it does not reduce or remove popups for other purposes, such as requests to consent to functional cookies.

4.3 Scenario 2: Processor Payment Service and Necessity for Contract Performance as Legal Basis

As a second scenario we consider a website that uses a processor to integrate payment services, allowing the data subject to make payments for their use of the website. As explained in section 4.1, we interpret the GPC specification such that entities acting as processors under the GDPR are not treated as third parties for the purposes of GPC. Consequently, because no third parties are involved in this processing, the use of GPC has no effect in this scenario.

Alternatively, even if we assume that processors are treated as third parties under the GPC specification, GPC would still have no effect because the data sharing with the payment service would be covered by the legal basis of necessity for contract performance. The processing of personal data would be necessary to fulfil a contract with the data subject.⁸⁶ This scenario illustrates the broader point that GPC is generally not applicable if contract performance serves as the legal basis.

4.4 Scenario 3: Third Parties and Legitimate Interests as Legal Basis

In our third scenario, as in the previous scenario, a website shares data with a payment service provider. However, in this scenario the payment service provider additionally conducts its own processing to prevent and detect scams and fraud. As the payment service provider solely determines the purpose and means of processing for these activities, it becomes a data controller under the GDPR.⁸⁷ Since the website, as the initial controller, has authorised the sharing of personal data, the payment service provider is also a third party for the processing activities of the website.

In this scenario we assume that the payment service provider relies on legitimate interests as the legal basis for its own processing activities.⁸⁸ Thus, the provider is obligated under the GDPR to conduct a three-tiered balancing test to ensure that (1) the interests pursued are legitimate, (2) the processing of personal data is necessary, and (3) the processing does not override the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject.⁸⁹ We assume that the payment service provider satisfies this evaluation in its use of legitimate interests. We also

⁸⁶ Article 6(1)(b) GDPR.

⁸⁷ EDPB Guidelines 07/2020 on the concepts of controller and processor in the GDPR
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files_en?file=2023-10/EDPB_guidelines_202007_controllerprocessor_final_en.pdf.

⁸⁸ Article 6(1)(f) GDPR; Recital 47 GDPR.

⁸⁹ Article 6(1)(f) GDPR, EDPB Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/documents/public-consultations/2024/guidelines-12024-processing-personal-data-based_en.

assume that the provider complies with other relevant obligations, for instance, regarding transparency.⁹⁰

If the data subject visits the website with an active GPC signal, the site can interpret it as an indication that the data subject wants to stop it from sharing data with third parties—namely, the payment service provider.⁹¹ Since the legal basis used for sharing data is the legitimate interests provision, the GDPR grants data subjects the right to object,⁹² including via ‘automated means using technical specifications.’⁹³ GPC principally meets this criterion and, thus, can serve as an indication that the data subject is exercising the right to object. As a practical matter, since the text of the GDPR does not specify which automated means controllers are required to accept, the use of GPC in this regard depends on EU legislators’ and regulators’ mandate to websites to recognize and act on the GPC signals they receive.

If the website accepts the use of GPC as a valid means to exercise the right to object, the GDPR allows controllers and third parties to refuse the objection by demonstrating compelling legitimate grounds that override the data subject’s interests, rights, and freedoms.⁹⁴ The standard for whether to refuse an objection is high. If a data subject has invoked the right to object against, it is not sufficient for the controller or the third party to just demonstrate that its earlier legitimate interest assessment regarding that processing was correct.⁹⁵ For legitimate grounds to be *compelling* they should be essential to the controller or to the third party in whose legitimate interest the data are being processed.⁹⁶ Examples of such cases are if a controller is compelled to process the personal data in order to protect its organisation or systems from serious immediate harm or from a severe penalty which would seriously affect its business.⁹⁷ In contrast, showing that the processing would simply be beneficial or advantageous to the controller would not necessarily meet this threshold.⁹⁸

⁹⁰ Article 14 GDPR regarding provision of notice when data not collected from the data subject, and EDPB Guidelines 07/2020 on the concepts of controller and processor in the GDPR
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/en?file=2023-10/EDPB_guidelines_202007_controllerprocessor_final_en.pdf.

⁹¹ Selling and cross-contextual ad targeting are not relevant for preventing and detecting scams and fraud.

⁹² Article 21(1) GDPR.

⁹³ Article 21(5) GDPR.

⁹⁴ Article 21(1) GDPR and §4 Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR,
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

⁹⁵ Article 21(1) GDPR and §4 Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR, para. 73,
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

⁹⁶ Article 21(1) GDPR and §4 Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR, para. 73,
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

⁹⁷ Article 21(1) GDPR and §4 Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR, para. 73,
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

⁹⁸ Article 21(1) GDPR and §4 Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data based on Article 6(1)(f) GDPR, para. 73,
https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

In our view, the applicability of GPC is limited to cases where a controller or third party lacks compelling legitimate grounds to override a data subject's right to object. In our scenario, the payment processor could argue that processing personal data is essential to detect fraud and prevent severe financial losses. If these grounds are deemed compelling—which may well be the case—they would override the data subject's objection. Consequently, in such instances, data subjects could not send GPC signals to exercise their right to object. If that were not the case, the controller or third party refusing to comply with the data subject's objection would need to demonstrate the grounds for the refusal to the data subject.⁹⁹ As the GPC specification does not provide for a mechanism to indicate acceptance or refusal of a right, the payment service provider may resort to popups or banners; mechanisms that the use of GPC is intended to reduce in the first place.

The payment service provider acting as the third party is also a processor for the website illustrating the possibility of one entity taking on multiple roles under the GDPR for different processing practices. In such cases, the use of GPC may not result in stopping the sharing, as the processor, in our scenario the payment service provider, will require the data to complete its contractual obligations with the controller, in our scenario the website. Given that the scope of the GPC signal is limited to preventing data sharing with third parties, GPC may not always have an impact on the further processing of data shared with a third party that also acts as a processor. However, to the extent processing activities can be cleanly separated, GPC would apply to a dual-role entity in its role as controller.

The third scenario demonstrates that GPC can be useful for data subjects to exercise the right to object under the GDPR where a third party relies on the legitimate interests provision as a legal basis. However, it also shows the need for a nuanced evaluation to identify which practices are covered by GPC and which are out of scope. This is especially important as data subjects may otherwise become inundated with popups, for example, explaining why their objection was refused.

4.5 Irrelevance of Non-Commercial Legal Bases

We focus our evaluation on the legal bases most relevant in the digital commercial ecosystem—consent, contract, and legitimate interests—because GPC is technically and functionally designed to address the voluntary selling and sharing of data and cross-contextual ad tracking in the ad ecosystem. Consequently, the remaining legal bases—legal obligation,¹⁰⁰ vital interests,¹⁰¹ and public interest or official authority¹⁰²—are not relevant here.

⁹⁹ While Article 21(1) GDPR does not specify to whom the justification must be demonstrated, we interpret this from 'controller fails to provide such proof' mentioned in para. 76 of Guidelines 1/2024 on processing of personal data Article 6(1)(f) GDPR.

https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-10/edpb_guidelines_202401_legitimateinterest_en.pdf.

¹⁰⁰ Article 6(1)(c) GDPR.

¹⁰¹ Article 6(1)(d) GDPR.

¹⁰² Article 6(1)(e) GDPR.

Processing grounded in a legal obligation is mandated by statute; an automated objection signal cannot legally nullify a controller's duty to comply with the law, e.g., retaining transaction records for tax compliance or fraud investigations. Similarly, processing necessary to protect vital interests typically involves life-critical emergencies where automated commercial privacy signals are neither practical nor legally pertinent. While data subjects have a right to object to processing based on public interest or official authority under Article 21(1) GDPR, GPC is irrelevant in our context as controllers are not carrying out tasks in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority.

5 Conclusions and Outlook: What Is Next for GPC in the EU?

The Challenge of GPC in EU Law. We evaluated GPC as a technical mechanism standardized at the W3C for its application under the current EU data protection framework. Our evaluation shows that while GPC can be aligned in fundamental respects with the EU framework, friction remains. The GPC specification's definitions are strongly influenced by US state privacy laws and do not map neatly to the EU framework. Consequently, without updates to the specification, its guide, legislative activity, or regulatory guidance, GPC would not be able to fully achieve its promise of automated rights exercise. It currently lacks the necessary doctrinal and practical support to achieve its intended effect in a legally enforceable manner in the EU.

The 'Empty GPC Canvas' in the EU. The discrepancies between GPC and the EU framework are resolvable and present an opportunity for EU legislators and regulators. GPC should be viewed not as a rigid standard, but as an 'empty GPC canvas' that legislators and regulators can interpret to improve data protection in the EU. This opportunity is particularly timely given the European Commission's Digital Omnibus proposal, which explicitly mandates the development of standards for automated, machine-readable indications of user choice. Rather than waiting for a perfect technical standard to emerge, EU legislators and regulators have the authority to map the existing, jurisdiction-agnostic GPC signal to a specific set of practices and rights under EU law. The GPC specification does not govern the law; rather, the law governs how the signal must be honoured. Therefore, EU authorities can—and should—define what GPC as a 'Do Not Process' signal means in the context of EU data protection law. It is their opportunity to fill the 'empty GPC canvas' with the legal requirements in the EU.

As part of the Digital Omnibus, automated signals like GPC can have legal enforceability under the GDPR. To support this initiative, our recommendations for the use of GPC in the EU are as follows:

- Where the legal basis is consent, the data subject is withdrawing their consent under Article 7(3) GDPR to the sharing of their personal data and cross-context ad targeting by third parties.
- Where the legal basis is legitimate interest, the data subject is objecting to their personal data being shared with third parties or being used for cross-context ad targeting under Article 21(1-3, 5).

- To avoid consent fatigue, the implementation of GPC in the EU should be accompanied with clear rules on when controllers should and should not display consent banners and popups.

Adoption and Enforcement. The trajectory of GPC adoption in the US offers a valuable insight for the EU: technical signals require legal backing to be effective. Successful implementation of data protection rights mechanisms requires the close integration of laws and technology. We already observe increasing compliance in US jurisdictions where GPC is legally enforceable, whereas the voluntary DNT standard largely failed. If the EU does not define and enforce data protection rights automation, it risks a paradoxical outcome where many US users—protected by various state laws—enjoy more seamless and automated data protection than EU residents, who remain burdened by manual consent management. Furthermore, even without explicit support in the EU, with its current momentum GPC is likely to become a broadly implemented standard. If websites in the EU implement it without legal clarity, the result could be a fragmented landscape of quasi-legal compliance that confuses both users and implementers.

Consent Fatigue and Future Standards. We began our inquiry with the question: ‘Can the GPC standard eliminate consent banners in the EU?’ Our answer is: ‘Partly and possibly more over time.’ GPC is a pragmatic starting point rather than a silver bullet. While it may not immediately eliminate all consent banners—particularly, given the requirements of the ePrivacy Directive—we think it can significantly reduce the burden on users over time as EU authorities develop and refine their interpretation of GPC. Critics might argue for a more granular, multi-option signal that maps directly to processing purposes under the GDPR, for example, but browser vendors are unlikely to implement any mechanism that increases the fingerprinting surface of their browsers more than necessary. Given that browsers will include a GPC setting to comply with California’s Opt Me Out Act, the most strategic path for the EU is to leverage this setting as well as the other parts of the existing GPC infrastructure. By mapping the GPC signal to a robust set of EU rights as much as possible, EU authorities can help overcome consent fatigue and ensure that technical standards serve EU data protection rights.

Acknowledgements

Sebastian Zimmeck has received funding from the National Science Foundation. Harshvardhan J. Pandit is part of the AI Accountability Lab, which has been funded under the AI Collaborative, an Initiative of the Omidyar Group; the Bestseller Foundation; and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; and is part of the ADAPT Centre for Digital Media Technology is funded by Research Ireland through the Research Centres Programme and is co-funded under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through Grant 13/RC/2106_P2, and has received funding through the RECITALS project funded by the European Commission's Horizon research and innovation programme under grant agreement No.101168490. Cristiana Santos has received funding from the Utrecht Centre for Regulation and Enforcement in Europe (RENFORCE). Konrad Kollnig has received funding from the Dutch National Growth Fund.

Sebastian Zimmeck is the editor, and Robin Berjon has been the former editor of the Global Privacy Control specification. Konrad Kollnig has a consulting/advisory relationship with the Open Data Institute.